DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 196 155 EA 013 208

TITLE	Sharing Educational Success. A Handbook for Validation of Educational Practices.
INSTITUTION	Association of State Advisory Councils and State Departments of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Sep 79
NOTE	52p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Innovation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Program Guides; *Program Validation; *Quality Control; Records (Forms); *Summative Evaluation

ABSTRACT

The identification, validation, dissemination (IVD) process represents a quality control effort whose ultimate purpose is to validate and disseminate projects of proven educational quality and significance. The IVD and the Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP) processes are complementary, although their procedures and criteria are distinct. JDRP is a national quality control panel while IVD is a state-level effort. This handbook is a guide for the IVD process, delineating each step of the procedure. The suggested format for the validation process is: (1) application submission to the state agency; (2) preliminary validation review followed by approval, revision, or disapproval; (3) selection of the validation team; (4) review of the application by individual team members; (5) on-site visit; (6) approval or disapproval based on the decision of the validation team, followed by recommendations. Qualifications for IVD personnel and suggestions for their training are offered. The application for validation must include project information and an overview, specific information concerning the program's effectiveness, and information concerning the program's exportability with respect to its educational significance: target population; materials, equipment, and facilities requirements; staffing and training requirements; minimum adoption requirements; and replication costs. (JK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED196155

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SHARING EDUCATIONAL SUCCESS

SHARING EDUCATIONAL SUCCESS

A Handbook for Validation of
Educational Practices

EA 013 208

D. H. E. W. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

SHARING EDUCATIONAL SUCCESS

A Handbook for Validation of

Educational Practices

September 1979

PROJECT OF
Association of State Advisory Councils
and
State Departments of Education
with assistance from the
U.S. Office of Education

This "application" is authorized by (20 USC 12 21e-3). While you are not required to report your cooperation is needed to obtain the best exemplary projects for dissemination.

DEC 4 1980

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION..... 1

Assumptions for an Identification, Validation, Dissemination Process..... 6

Steps in the Validation process..... 9

Qualifications of IVD Personnel.....12

Training of IVD Personnel.....13

Application for Validation.....17

I. Information and Overview.....19

II. Effectiveness/Success.....20

III. Exportability.....26

Validation Team Report.....28

Summary Sheet.....44

Bibliography.....47

INTRODUCTION

Over the past several years, the federal government annually has allocated millions of dollars to state and local educational agencies for the purpose of developing and implementing programs, practices and products to stimulate the improvement of education. These projects are designed to address problems or needs that not only exist within an applicant school district, but may also coincide with the educational priorities of State Boards of Education or the U.S. Office of Education.

In many instances the projects supported through various federal funding sources have succeeded in producing significant and desirable changes in learner achievement, in realizing staffing and management efficiencies, or a high level of community participation in solving educational problems or needs. Current federal legislation indicates that this kind of developmental effort is likely to have continued support in the foreseeable future.

Since state and federally funded projects primarily are intended to develop and test potential solutions to common problems rather than to address unique local needs, maximum impact of developmental projects can best be realized only if successful projects can be and are implemented in other locations within the state, the region, or the nation. Agencies at both the federal and state level, therefore, have a vested interest in identifying and sharing successful programs, or successful practices and products developed within such programs. Through sharing, successful

programs, practices and products that can be disseminated, and the costs of needlessly reinventing solutions can be eliminated through systematic adoption or adaption of a validated program.

Why a Validation Program?

In recent years, educators throughout the nation have called for the establishment of credible standards and guidelines to validate new educational programs, practices or products which have been developed and implemented through projects in our schools. Such a validation process seeks to serve a dual function: First, it would provide a systematic mechanism by which the educational value and effectiveness of emerging programs, practices and products could be reviewed and assessed as to their success; i.e., the purposes and outcomes of developmental projects would be "proven to work." Second, the validation process would enable the creation of a bank of proven educational practices. Once programs and products have been validated as effective and exportable, they could be entered into this bank of successful programs. The validation program, therefore, addressed the need to identify and to certify programs and practices that could facilitate constructive educational changes in our nation's public and non-profit private schools, and provides guidance not only in establishing the educational worth of a project at its original site but also in its successful replication in other school systems.

Scope of Program to be Validated

There is no limitation to the number of educational programs which could utilize the validation process in determining the success of the program activities upon the learner. Any academic program or practice

within elementary or secondary schools which implement measurable objectives to manage their program and have collected objective data to substantiate the statistical and educational significance of the data gathered as a result of the treatment provided to learners can be validated by the process described in this handbook.

Inasmuch as a companion handbook entitled Sharing Business Success (SBS) has recently been adapted from the Sharing Educational Success (SES) process it would be inappropriate to utilize SES to validate business oriented programs.

Present Validation Programs

Tw existing quality control processes presently being used throughout the nation are the Identification, Validation and Dissemination (IVD) and Joint Dissemination Review Process. Additionally, several states have attempted to incorporate and build upon the special strengths and advantages of the two quality control programs in developing their own state validation process.

The Identification, Validation, Dissemination (IVD) Process

The IVD process was initiated jointly by the National Advisory Council for Supplementary Centers and Services, State ESEA Title III Coordinators and ESEA Title III personnel in the U.S. Office of Education, and the National Association of State Advisory Council Chairmen, with input and assistance from the State Departments of Education.

The IVD process represents a quality control effort with the ultimate purpose being to validate and disseminate projects of proven educational quality and significance. The process is guided by a handbook, entitled Sharing Educational Success, which delineates each step of the procedure.

Some of the major strengths of the IVD process are 1) its heavy emphasis on site visitation by well-trained validation teams, 2) the strong sense of support and involvement on the part of project developers and implementors of the process at state and local levels, 3) the wide spread visibility which has been given to IVD-validated projects by the National Advisory Council for Supplementary Centers and Services, 4) the inclusion in the application for validation of extensive program descriptions which aid adopters in understanding the context of the validation practice, and 5) its use of a model that is readily comprehended and applied.

The IVD process is used by a number of states; however, in recent years, some states have chosen to modify or adapt the USOE guidelines to reduce the cost and to more directly reflect state needs and priorities. Regardless of which IVD process has been used, projects which successfully attain validation through IVD on the state level are usually encouraged to seek validation by the Joint Dissemination Review Panel.

The Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP) Process

The Joint Dissemination Review Panel, originally a part of the U.S. Office of Education only, was enlarged in 1975 by the addition of representatives from the National Institute of Education. The USOE/NIE members of the JDRP are chosen for their experience in education and their ability to analyze evaluative evidence on the effectiveness of educational products and practices. The JDRP meets periodically to review the evidence of effectiveness submitted for a wide variety of educational projects.

Submissions are made directly to the Panel by USOE and NIE program offices, which are responsible for identifying potentially exemplary projects and for carrying out a review screening. The screening process focuses on the project's factual accuracy, social fairness, consumer protection considerations, as well as looks for evidence of effectiveness and exportability. Only those submissions that are approved by the JDRP may be in any way endorsed by the Education Division, or disseminated as exemplary by using Federal Education Division funds.

Effectiveness is the sole criterion for approval by the JDRP. No judgments are made regarding the desirability of programs, practices or products from any other standpoint. "Effectiveness," however, is not defined simplistically; in order for the JDRP to determine that a given program, practice, or product is effective, several conditions must be met. The evidence must be valid and reliable; the effect must be of sufficient magnitude to have educational importance; and it should be possible to reproduce both the intervention and its effects at other sites. These considerations give rise to the specific criteria used by the Panel in judging the evidence of positive impact.

A thorough and detailed description of the purposes of the JDRP, discussion and examples of judgmental criteria of effectiveness, and procedures for submitting a project for review by the Panel are documented in the publication entitled, Ideabook: The Joint Dissemination Review Panel. Persons interested in submitting a project for JDRP validation are encouraged to obtain a copy of this publication.*

The IVD and JDRP processes are complementary. Although the procedures and criteria used for these two validation approaches are quite distinct, an effort has been made to coordinate the criteria and requirements of both. JDRP is the national USOE-NIE quality control panel while IVD is a state level effort supported by USOE.

---

* The Joint Dissemination Review Panel IDEABOOK. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, October 1977.

State-Level IVD Process

A few states have developed a state-level IVD process which draws upon many of the significant elements of both IVD and JDRP, but represents more than a composite of these two processes. In general, the state IVD process attempts to develop a state-administered procedure for the quality control of programs, practices and products that are consonant with and responsive to the needs of an individual state. Further, because the validation process involves the participation of individuals and projects that come from a more limited geographical area, the major benefit expected to accrue is that the validation process promises to be more cost-effective.

It is expected, however, that many of the projects submitted for state validation will subsequently be submitted for review by the JDRP. Moreover, it is assumed that programs, practices and products validated through state IVD processes will undoubtably be disseminated within that state or, as a minimum expectation, be made available to other interested school districts within the state via existing program diffusion or information systems administered by the state agency.

Assumptions for a Federal-State Validation Process

Recent in-depth examinations of the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of existing IVD processes have led to the identification of several basic assumptions regarding the cooperative federal-state IVD process. The outcomes of these studies, as well as input from educational practitioners at all levels of program involvement, have stimulated this revision of the national IVD handbook, Sharing Educational Success.

Three major needs have been identified which serve to place into a new context the procedures that must be developed for the national and state management of a validation system.

First, there is a need to identify a cadre of individuals at the state level who are well trained to ensure quality control of the validation standards nationally.

Second, there is a need for state autonomy in the validation process -- to modify, within federal guidelines, processes and procedures for project validation, and to train and use on-site validation team members of the state's choosing.

Third, there is a need to cut the cost of the IVD process at both the national and state levels.

The identification of key management needs reflected above has led to the specification of several basic assumptions underlying state participation in the IVD process. These assumptions have been incorporated into the revision of Sharing Educational Success but are worthy of delineation in this introductory chapter. The basic assumptions are as follows:

1. The responsibility for the administration of the joint federal-state validation system must be located in a setting that will encourage cooperation across funding-source lines. No one funding source can or should own the validation process.

2. Evidence of success can be shown in a number of ways and may not always require student change data. Viable evidence of a successful program, practice, or product may include, but not necessarily be limited to, such documented changes as improvement of student learning; attainment of management efficiencies such as more cost-effective practices or improvements in staff utilization; business practices; increased levels of community participation in educational programs.

3. The educational significance of a project should be examined in terms of the potential solutions to general educational problems or needs which can be met through implementation of a tested program, practice, or product. Such solutions must be validated as being "exportable" to other schools seeking solutions to their problems or needs.

4. Having a successful project and having the capability to diffuse that program, practice, or product to another site are related but separate processes of validation. The project which has been evaluated as having produced significant change in the parent school district must also demonstrate its capability to be effective in helping other schools within a geographic area or nationally.

5. Since one major purpose of the validation process is to identify projects for potential entry into federal or state diffusion systems, the IVD process must therefore be consumer oriented. The consumer-protection criteria inherent in the IVD process must call for the presentation and testing of evidence of success or effectiveness, including a test of its educational significance, and be judged to be exportable to other sites interested in adopting or adapting the project or its component elements.

6. Successful completion of the federal-state IVD process should be tied to a "pay off" to the project and to the state. Such rewards may include, but not be limited to entry into a state-operated diffusion network, access to funds for project diffusion, preliminary screening for national JDRP validation, or to otherwise serve as a vehicle for educational improvement within the state.

Overview of Procedures

Steps in the Validation Process

The following suggested format for the validation process can be modified by individual states according to local needs and available resources. Options to individual steps are provided as suggestions and reflect some time and cost savings procedures that are currently being used by some states.

1. L.E.A. completes and submits application for validation to the state agency or office responsible for coordinating validation activities at the state level.

2. Preliminary review by the state agency for validation followed by:
   a. approval for validation team review; or
   b. return to the L.E.A. for revision according to suggestions; or
   c. disapproval for further validation.

3. Selection of the validation team:

   a. the team leader to be selected from out-of-state from the list of U.S.O.E.-rained team leaders within the region.

   b. two team members selected from within the state from the list of State trained members.

4. Review of application by individual team members (This may be done as individuals in isolation from the other team members or the team may be convened to review an individual application or serve as a panel to review a group of applications):

   a. the team leader makes recommendations to the state agency responsible for validation that the identified revisions are to be completed before the on-site team visit is conducted.

   b. the team leader informs the state agency responsible for validation that the on-site visit be conducted according to the existing application.

5. Conduct of the on-site visit. The most frequent procedure is to send all team members on-site. Some states have designated an individual team member to conduct the on-site visit as a cost svings measure. The individual conducting the on-site visit serves the role of collecting and clarifying any incomplete or missing information identified by the review of the application by the whole team.

6. The primary decision of the validation team is either approval or diasppproval under the IVD standards.

If approved the team might also make the following recommendations:

1. Submission to J.D.R.P.
2. State Dissemination
3. A special component or product by recognized as worthy of distribution

If the project is not validated it might be given consideration under a State evaluative process to identify worthy products or components.

QUALIFICATIONS OF IVD PERSONNEL

One of the vital elements in the validation process is the selection and use of qualified validators. To qualify, a person should have considerable school experience, be academically prepared and/or conducted research in recent years, and be successfully trained as a validator. These qualifications are vital in the objective reviews of evaluation data and evidence.

Team Leader

1. Five years recent experience in educational management and evaluation.
2. Attendance at U.S.O.E. training session to train team leaders.
3. Certification by U.S.O.E. as a team leader.

State Team Members

1. Should include persons with an extensive background in the area of evaluation. Experience in program development and implementation is also necessary.
2. Attendance at a state training session to train team members.
3. Certification by state as a team member.

Generally, three team members are selected to validate a program. A fourth team member should be considered if the areas to be evaluated are extensive or the size of the program makes a fourth member necessary.

Regional Training

Training for IVD Personnel

Training of two IVD state team leaders from each state will be conducted by U.S. Office of Education staff members; also included will be one representative from each of the Regional Office dissemination personnel.

Each region, including state team trainers and the Regional Office dissemination staff, will conduct the training for on-site validators in that region.

A minimum of three highly qualified potential validators from each state will be trained. The selection of these persons will be made by the state validation coordinator. If it is determined that the projected IVD activity will require more on-site validators, additional well qualified people could be trained.

All potential validators must participate in one of the training sessions and be certified before conducting an on-site visit.

The training sessions will include orientation to the validation concept and the use of the validation handbook; training in techniques for verification of evidence; techniques for information gathering, including how to ask questions; type of data to be sought; the observation technique; and verification of evidence of public support for the practice.

The team chairperson should receive additional training at the sessions in on-site duties and the preparation of the team report.

Certification of Validators

To become a validator, an individual must first meet the qualifications set forth under the Qualifications of the IVD Personnel. Individuals will then be selected because of their expertise in one or more of the validation criteria. The next requirement is to successfully complete an O.E./SEA approved validation training program. Having met these requirements a person is then certified as a "Sharing Educational Success Validator."

The O.E. Regions will be coterminous with the existing HEW regions which are identified below:

Region I	Maine Vermont New Hampshire Massachusetts Connecticut Rhode Island	Boston, Massachusetts
Region II	New York New Jersey Puerto Rico Virgin Islands	New York, New York
Region III	Pennsylvania West Virginia Virginia Maryland Delaware Washington, D.C.	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Region IV	Kentucky Tennessee North Carolina South Carolina Mississippi Alabama Georgia Florida	Atlanta, Georgia
Region V	Minnesota Wisconsin Michigan Ohio Illinois Indiana	Chicago, Illinois
Region VI	New Mexico Texas Oklahoma Arkansas Louisiana	Dallas, Texas
Region VII	Nebraska Iowa Missouri Kansas	Kansas City, Missouri

Region VIII	Wyoming Utah Montana Colorado North Dakota South Dakota	Denver, Colorado
Region IX	California Nevada Arizona Hawaii American Samoa Guam Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands	San Francisco, California
Region X	Alaska Washington Oregon Idaho	Seattle, Washington

APPLICATION FOR VALIDATION

Information, as detailed on the following pages, will be supplied by the local education agency and will be evaluated by the validation team to determine if the program, practice or product qualifies for endorsement. The responses to each item will be studied by each validation team member and verified or clarified on site by one or more members of the team. Evidence relating to each major objective will be evaluated separately, but will be viewed as an integrated whole in making the final recommendation for acceptance or rejection as a validated program or practice.

The format for application information is provided on the following pages under the headings listed below. The applicant should follow the specific directions provided and confine application materials to space limitations suggested for each item (double-spaced typing).

Application Information Categories

I. Information and Overview

- A. Applicant information
- B. Abstract or Overview

II. Effectiveness/Success

- A. Purpose and Objectives
- B. Program Activities
- C. Evaluation Design
- D. Results and Analysis

III. Exportability

A. Educational Significance

B. Target Population(s)

C. Materials, Equipment, and Facilities

D. Staffing and Training Requirements

E. Minimum Adoption Requirements

F. Replication Costs

Note to Applicants

As one of your major sources of data and information your application for validation should include references to existing program performance reports. Inasmuch as the quality and brevity of responses is most desirable you can encourage the onsite validation team members to avail themselves of the entire performance report for further edification.

Application
for Validation

A. Applicant Information

A. POJECT INFORMATION

Area of concern _____
(e.g., Career Education, Handicapped, Reading, etc.)

Project Title _____

Project Director's Name _____

_____
Address City State Zip Code

Phone Number (include area code) _____

Application Agency _____

Location _____
(Street Address)

_____
City State Zip Code

Superintendent's Name _____

_____
Address City State Zip Code

Phone Number (include area code) _____

Project Period: beginning _____ (date); ending _____ (date)

Expenditures Grant Period		Federal Funds	Other Funds	Total Funds
_____	TO _____	$_____	$_____	$_____
_____	TO _____	$_____	$_____	$_____
_____	TO _____	$_____	$_____	$_____
_____	TO _____	$_____	$_____	$_____
	TOTAL	$_____	$_____	$_____

B. Project Abstract or Overview

Summarize in no more than two pages the essence of the program or practice including the following key elements:

1. Target group
2. Needs addressed
3. What you did (process)
4. Results
5. Significance of results
6. Cost and exportability factors

II. Effectiveness/Success

The documented effectiveness or success of a program or practice is of paramount importance for validation. A program or practice can be "proven to work" in numerous ways including: 1) by demonstrating with convincing evidence that the program will bring about desired change or improvement over the existing practices, 2) by demonstrating a more efficient or cost-effective program or practice through improved management, resource utilization, etc., or 3) by demonsrating with convincing evidence that a desired objective may be accomplished without detriment to the existing program.

In each of the foregoing the key concept is convincing evidence which suggests the most credible standards of proof that are possible within the context of the organizational setting.

A. Purpose and Objectives

1. Identify the major purpose of the program or practice.

   This statement is to give the broad perspective of the project so that the reviewer may better understand how the inclusion or exclusion of any single objective may affect the overall or major purpose. The statement of this broad objective should be simple and straight forward, not requiring delineation of specific dimensions or levels. An example might be: "The purpose of Project XXX is to increase the basic reading skills for the handicapped in School District X" or "The general purpose of Project XXX is to reduce sex role stereotyping of job options for elementary students in School District X."

2. List the anticipated changes or objectives of the program or practice.

   Ordinarily major objectives will be limited to no more than three or four. They may include cognitive, affective (attitudinal) or psychomotor behavioral changes. Product objectives should be stated in measurable terms reflecting who, upon completion of the program, will be able to do what at what level of performance.

   Process objectives may reflect major components of the program, but must include in their statement reference to some meaningful criteria. In the final analysis, the objectives should be written in such a manner that evidence may be systematically gathered to reflect their attainment. Ordinarily, process or enabling objectives alone will not provide sufficient evidence to validate the success of a project. (Suggested length: single statement for each objective)

3. Identify how much change in process or behavior was expected for each objective if this was not included in the statement of objectives. If so, omit this item.

   Change may be defined in terms of absolute or judgmental standards or with reference to normal expectations. If the statement of objectives in the previous item did not incorporate the anticipated change, for example, 30% increase in growth rate as compared to the national norm or statistically significant increase in reading scores, the anticipated changes should be specified within the framework of an understandable rationale.

4. Describe how the major objectives are interrelated and if they are of equal importance.

   The reviewer must be able to judge if any objectives, and which ones, can be eliminated without destroying the credibility and educational significance of the program. Objectives that are absolutely essential to the project's success must be known. (Suggested length: single statement if possible)

5. Identify new or unanticipated objectives as well as any objectives that were deleted during the project.

   If, because of formative evaluation or for some reality concerns, the major objectives of the project as originally defined have changed (additions, deletions or major modifications), explain such changes in terms of the project's major purpose, the educational significance of the project and pattern of interrelationship among objectives. The response to this item may give the reviewer a better understanding of the developmental nature of this project and its relationship to the stated purpose. (Suggested length: No more than 1/3 page)

B. Program Activities

1. Describe the process(s) including each key element such as:

   a. What the learner did differently
   b. What the teacher did differently
   c. Use of traditional or non-traditional materials
   d. Special management plan(s)
   e. Duration and intensity of process (i.e., daily schedule)
   f. Involvement of parents and/or community

   This description should give an overview of the project including unique aspects of the program. Be specific in describing the process, documenting any "packaged" or borrowed approaches. For purposes of evaluation it is absolutely essential to know the amount and duration of intervention and special qualifications of staff. (Suggested length: two pages)

C. Evaluation Design

1. Describe briefly the evaluation design utilized in the project. (Time series, baseline, norm referenced, traditional experimental-control design, discrepancy model, case study, etc.)

The purpose of clear description of the evaluation design is to enable the reviewer to know if changes brought about as a result of the intervention process can be attributed to that process and are not a result of chance, special kinds of motivation, the regression phenomenon, the Hawthorne effect or some other intervening variables. If sampling techniques were utilized this should be stated and described, since the ability to generalize the results will depend on the representativeness of the subjects. (Suggested length: 1/2 page)

2. Establish that the evaluation instruments or data gathering techniques utilized were valid, reliable and sensitive.

The instruments utilized represent the operational definition of the objectives. Thus, the validity, reliability and sensitivity of the data gathering devices are of signal importance. If the instruments are standardized the data are available within the technical manual and can be briefly summarized with appropriate references. If the instruments were "tailor made" the procedure should be briefly described citing the way in which the instrument was validated, how reliability or consistency was determined, as well as characteristics such as range, freedom from offensiveness, administration and interpretation guidelines, etc. If norm-referenced tests were utilized, the norms should be described. If criterion-referenced instruments were used, the manner in which criteria levels were set should be noted.

Evaluation or data gathering devices may include in addition to tests, controlled observation, rating scales, checklists, etc.; but if such devices are utilized the above technical considerations should be carefully reported. Unsubstantiated intuitive judgments are not acceptable.

The following format is suggested for each instrument:

a. Test or data gathering device:
b. Validity:
c. Reliability:
d. Norm group (if norm-referenced tests):
e. Criteria levels (if criterion-referenced tests).
f. Other relevant characteristics:

(Suggested length: 1/3 page per objective)

3. Show that evidence was systematically gathered and recorded.

The following Chart A which provides a format for recording the evaluation data is suggested.

D. Results and Analysis

1. Report the results of the process intervention. Relate these results to specified objectives, both process and product. Indicate whether the results met or varied from expectations.

   The following format would be helpful in responding to this item.

   Objective #1

   a. Expected change or anticipated outcome
   b. Actual change or results. Utilize charts, graphics, statistical summaries where appropriate.
   c. Significance of results--either statistical or otherwise. If other than statistical provide rationale for evaluation of significance.

   Objective #2

   Same as above for each additional objective.

   Overall Project Results:

   a. Estimate of educational or practical significance of findings.
   b. Brief interpretation of results

   (Suggested length: 1/2 page per objective plus 1/2 page overall project interpretation)

2. Show that the results were systematically and competently analyzed.

3. Report unanticipated outcomes of major importance and significance.

   Include in this item spin-off or unplanned changes that took place as a result of this project. Note whether such changes qualified in retrospect as a major objective in terms of the stated need for the project. (Suggested length: 1/3 page)

   Suggested format is to complete data analysis section of Chart A including qualifications of data analysis personnel.

Chart A
Record of Data Collection and Analysis

OBJECTIVE	EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS	DATA COLLECTION			DATA ANALYSIS	
		COLLECTED ON WHOM	WHEN COLLECTED	COLLECTED BY WHOM	HOW ANALYZED	ANALYSIS

III EXPORTABILITY

The documented success of a program is an essential part in making that program available for diffusion. The actual process of diffusion may require a different, but related, set of program activities and materials. This section will identify and document the program's capability to diffuse a successful program. (No more than 1/2 page should be used to respond to the following items.)

1. Educational significance

Defend what you have done in terms of its importance to the general educational community. How widespread is the problem you have addressed? What benefit would another school site gain from the replication of what you have done? Has your program been replicated in another site with similar results? For example: see Section V, Criterion III of the Ideabook.

2. Target Population

Describe the appropriate learner population for the replication of your program. Detail any unique variables about your community, school or population that influenced the success of your program. Are these variables limiting factors that should influence the decision to replicate your program?

3. Staffing and training requirements

Describe any special staffing that is necessary and any training that your program is currently capable of providing to a staff that will replicate your program. Are the special staff persons commonly available in a school setting? Can the training be segmented to be performed in small time periods that would not significantly disrupt the replication site schedule?

4. Materials, equipment, facilities

Describe all required program materials, equipment and facilities necessary to replicate your program. During the on-site, provide copies of the materials used: (1) by students in your program, (2) by teachers and/or special staff, (3) to diffuse your program to another site.

5. Minimum Adoption or replication

Describe what would constitute a minimum level replication of your program that would produce similar results to those you have documented as successful. Are there parts or components of your program that could be replicated in absence of others?

6. Replication Costs

Detail the cost of replicating your program. Include costs of training, materials and other start up costs. Assume any special staff and facilities will be pre-existing in the replication site.

7. Special Problems

Detail any special problems that are likely to be encountered in the replication and operation of your program. How were these problems overcome in your setting and how could they be avoided in the replication?

SHARING EDUCATIONAL SUCCESS

VALIDATION

REPORT

_____

NAME OR PROJECT

_____

NAME AND ADDRESS

_____

OF SUBMITTING SCHOOL DISTRICT

PROJECT OF
Association of State Advisory Councils
and
State Departments of Education
with assistance from the
U.S. Office of Education

IVD FORM

VALIDATION TEAM REPORT

I. Information and Overview

A. Applicant information

	YES	NO
Program information appears complete and accurate.	☐	☐

ITEMS IN THIS SECTION NEEDING ON-SITE CLARIFICATION.

B. Abstract or Overview

	YES	NO
Abstract is clear and reflects focus and results of the program.	☐	☐

ITEMS IN THIS SECTION NEEDING ON-SITE CLARIFICATION.

II. Effectiveness/Success

A. Purpose and Objectives

	YES	NO
1. Major purpose of program is clearly stated.	☐	☐
2. Program objectives are clearly stated.	☐	☐
3. Change criteria are clearly specified.	☐	☐
4. Interrelationship of objectives clearly explained.	☐	☐
5. Unanticipated or deleted objectives described, if any.	☐	☐

ITEMS IN THIS SECTION NEEDING ON-SITE CLARIFICATION.

	YES	NO
Purpose and objective section acceptable for validation.	☐	☐

B. Program Activities

	YES	NO
1. Learner activities are well defined.	☐	☐
2. Teacher activities are well defined.	☐	☐
3. Material utilization is described.	☐	☐
4. Management plan is adequately detailed.	☐	☐
5. Duration and intensity is described.	☐	☐
6. Use of parents and/or community is described.	☐	☐

ITEMS IN THIS SECTION NEEDING ON-SITE CLARIFICATION.

	YES	NO
Program activities section acceptable for validation	☐	☐

C. Evaluation Design

	YES	NO
1. Evaluation design is valid and appropriate for the project.	☐	☐
2. Evaluation instruments or data gathering techniques utilized were valid, reliable and sensitive.	☐	☐
3. Evidence was systematically gathered and recorded.	☐	☐

ITEMS IN THIS SECTION NEEDING ON-SITE CLARIFICATION.

	YES	NO
Evaluation Design section acceptable for validation.	☐	☐

D. Results and Analysis

1. Results reported completely and accurately for each objective:

	YES	NO
Objective #1	☐	☐
Objective #2	☐	☐
Objective #3	☐	☐
Objective #4	☐	☐

2. Data were analyzed completely and appropriately:

	YES	NO
Objective #1	☐	☐
Objective #2	☐	☐
Objective #3	☐	☐
Objective #4	☐	☐

3. Results were significant:

	YES	NO
Objective #1	☐	☐
Objective #2	☐	☐
Objective #3	☐	☐

4. Unanticipated outcomes of major importance and significance are identified.

	YES	NO
Objective #1	☐	☐
Objective #2	☐	☐
Objective #3	☐	☐
Objective #4	☐	☐

ITEMS IN THIS SECTION NEEDING ON-SITE CLARIFICATION.

	YES	NO
Results and analysis section acceptable for validation.	☐	☐

39

II. Exportability

A. Educational Significance

	YES	NO
1. The purpose of the program reflects a recognized educational need.	☐	☐
2. Need for the program is documented by an adoption of the program if possible.	☐	☐
3. The program effect is generalizable.	☐	☐
4. The magnitude of change is great enough to be convincing. (e.g., an increase of at least 1/3 of a standard deviation, see IDEABOOK Section V. Criterion III.	☐	☐

ITEMS IN THIS SECTION NEEDING ON-SITE CLARIFICATION.

	YES	NO
Educational significance section acceptable for validation.	☐	☐

B. Target Population

	YES	NO
1. Target population is well defined.	☐	☐
2. Unique variables for the population would not significantly limit potential adopters of the program.	☐	☐

ITEMS IN THIS SECTION NEEDING ON-SITE CLARIFICATION.

	YES	NO
Target population section acceptable for validation.	☐	☐

41

C. Staffing and Training Requirements

	YES	NO
1. Special staffing requirements are clearly defined.	☐	☐
2. Special staffing requirements are minimal i.e., existing staff could be retrained.	☐	☐
3. A plan for training staff exists.	☐	☐
4. Program staff will be available for training adopters.	☐	☐

ITEMS IN THIS SECTION NEEDING ON-SITE CLARIFICATION.

	YES	NO
Staffing and training section acceptable for validation.	☐	☐

D. Materials, Equipment, Facilities

	YES	NO
1. Essential materials, equipment and facilities are identified. (copies of materials should be available for review by on-site team.)	☐	☐
2. Special materials and/or equipment are readily available for purchase or distribution.	☐	☐

ITEMS IN THIS SECTION NEEDING ON-SITE CLARIFICATION.

	YES	NO
Materials, equipment, facilities section acceptable for validation.	☐	☐

43

E. Minimum Adoption or Replication

	YES	NO
1. Separate components of the program are well defined and identifiable, i.e., assessment, treatment, management, training, etc.	☐	☐
2. A minimum adoption is well defined and represents a reasonable expectation of a replication site.	☐	☐

ITEMS IN THIS SECTION NEEDING ON-SITE CLARIFICATION.

	YES	NO
Minimum adoption or replication section acceptable for validation.	☐	☐

F. Replication Costs

	YES	NO
1. Reported replication costs appear to be an accurate estimate of start-up costs.	☐	☐
2. Start-up costs are minimal and within the availability of most replication site resources.	☐	☐

ITEMS IN THIS SECTION NEEDING ON-SITE CLARIFICATION.

	YES	NO
Replication costs section acceptable for validation.	☐	☐

G. Special Problems

	YES	NO
1. There are no insurmountable problems identified that would prevent a replication of the program.	☐	☐
2. Workable solutions are suggested for major, anticipated problems.	☐	☐

ITEMS IN THIS SECTION NEEDING ON-SITE CLARIFICATION.

	YES	NO
Special problems section acceptable for validation.	☐	☐

VALIDATION REPORT

The report of the Validation Team consists of the following sections:

A. Project Information Sheet (Part 1 A of Application).

B. Abstract of Project (Part I B of Application)

C. Statement by Review Committee of outstanding or unique qualities of project. (Not to exceed one page.)

D. Final recommendation of the Review Committee.

E. Final recommendation of Validation Team:

Program or Practice:

Not recommended

Recommended

JDRP submission encouraged

Sign off by Committee:

Signature of Review Committee:	Address and Telephone Number:
1. _____ (Chairman)	_____
	_____
2. _____	_____
	_____
3. _____	_____
	_____
$. _____	_____
	_____

IVD Form

SUMMARY SHEET

	Section Rating	
	Acceptable	Not Acceptable
I. Information & Overview		
A. Project Information Complete	☐	☐
B. Project Abstract Clear	☐	☐
II. Effectiveness/Success		
A. Purpose & Objectives	☐	☐
B. Program Activities	☐	☐
C. Evaluation Design	☐	☐
D. Results & Analysis	☐	☐
III. Exportability		
A. Educational Significance	☐	☐
B. Target Populations	☐	☐
C. Staffing & Training Requirements	☐	☐
D. Materials, Equipment, & Facilities	☐	☐
E. Minimum Adoption Requirements	☐	☐
F. Replication Costs	☐	☐
G. Special Problems in Replication	☐	☐

Final Recommendation: (Check appropriate box)

	YES	NO
Program or practice is not recommended for validation	☐	☐
Program or practice recommended for validation	☐	☐
JDRP submission encouraged	☐	☐

Comments and special recommendations of the Review Team - Include mention of curriculum material or procedures of special merit from programs which were not validated.

Validation Report

CERTIFICATION BY SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT

Name of Project: _____

School District: _____

Address: _____

I hereby certify that the above cited project, which is under my administration, will, if validated, and if State or other funds are available, serve as a State or National demonstration site for a period of at least one calendar year from the date of notification of such selection.

_____
Superintendent of School District

_____
Date

IVD FORM

CERTIFICATION BY CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICER

I hereby certify that:

1. Project: _____ (Title)

   in the _____ (name of local education agency) was visited on _____ (date)

   by a team of _____ (No. of team members) experienced and trained validators.

2. The team consisted of: _____ (Name) _____ (State)

   _____ (Name) _____ (State)

   _____ (Name) _____ (State)

   _____ (Name) _____ (State)

3. I have examined the team's final report, and based on the data reported, I am satisfied that the project meets all the criteria of exemplariness and is hereby declared validated.

_____
(Chief State School Officer)

_____
Date

Bibliography

Bloom, B.S., Englehart, M.D., Furst, E.J., Hill, W.H. Urathwohl, D.R. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook I: Cognitive Domai.. David McKay Co. Inc., New York 1956.

The Joint Dissemination Review Panel IDEABOOK. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, October 1977.

GPO 861 849